

STAT

✓ Mr. Pierre Salinger *card*
Press Assistant to Senator Kennedy
Room 362, Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Salinger:

Reference is made to our letter of 17 October 1960 and the attachment thereto.

Mr. Dulles has asked that I forward to you for Senator Kennedy the fifth in the series of our memoranda covering world comment on the Republican and Democratic national tickets.

Sincerely,

[redacted]
Acting Executive Officer

STAT

Attachment

Special Memo

No. 5, 27 Oct 60

O/DCI/ [redacted] vgd 28 Oct 60

Distribution:

orig and encl - Addressee

✓ JSE w/o encl

✓ - ER w/encl

STAT Attachment is [redacted] No 5, "World Comment on Republican
and Democratic National Tickets"

[Redacted]

STAT

SPECIAL MEMORANDUM

[Redacted]

FOREIGN COMMENT ON
REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL TICKETS

NO. 5 -- 27 OCTOBER 1960

[Redacted]

STAT

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

USSR	1
EAST GERMANY	4
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	5
BULGARIA	8
HUNGARY	9
YUGOSLAVIA	11
COMMUNIST CHINA	11

OTHER COUNTRIES

UNITED KINGDOM	16
FRANCE	16
WEST GERMANY	17
SWEDEN	18
TUNISIA	20
ISRAEL	20
CUBA	21
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	26
NONCOMMUNIST CHINA	27
SOUTH VIETNAM	30
AUSTRALIA	38

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5

KENNEDY, NIXON SUPPORT BANKRUPT POLICY

Moscow, Soviet European Service in Danish, Oct. 11, 1960, 1930 GMT--L

(Excerpts) The ordinary American, burdened by taxes and wearied by the war psychosis, longs for peace. The election platforms of the two big parties, including their foreign policy sections, pursue quite different aims, however. The basis of their foreign policy program is the bankrupt policy of strength.

The Republican Party has as its main aim an increase in U.S. military potential. Eisenhower, speaking at his party's convention, pointed out, as though it were very meritorious, that military expenditure during his term had more than quadrupled. Vice President Nixon proclaims that the United States will pay most attention in its policy to military considerations. Kennedy, the Democratic Party's presidential candidate, also demands an increase in military appropriations. These statements are far removed from the promises of peace which the Democratic and Republican parties inserted in their election platforms to camouflage their true foreign policy.

It must be emphasized that both parties of U.S. capitalism try to justify the arms race with nonsense about an imaginary threat of communism. The press, radio, and television, all propaganda media, are directed at frightening the electors with the Red threat which is supposed to hover over the United States.

What is the cause of this anti-Soviet hysteria? The peace-determined foreign policy of the USSR must be known to everyone. The Soviet Government has submitted to the United Nations concrete proposals for worldwide and total disarmament. In this respect, the USSR has implemented several unilateral measures, such as relinquishing military bases on the territories of other countries, reducing considerably its armed forces, stopping nuclear tests, and much else. The U.S. ruling circles know this; what, then, makes them wave the anticommunist banner? To understand the real idea behind anticommunism one must turn to history. Today the idea of a crusade against communism has been seized on by the U.S. imperialists. Under cover of this slogan, aggression is being prepared against the socialist countries. This has been frankly stated by Vice President Nixon, who has declared that he intends to pursue the strategy which is called "victory over communism."

With the slogan of the struggle against communism the U.S. ruling circles are trying to suppress every liberation movement. A clear example of this is Guatemala, where the U.S. Government made use of the anticommunist slogan to smash the national liberation movement. Today the United States is trying in vain to repeat this attempt in Cuba.

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5

It is furthermore necessary to mention that anticommunism still plays an important role among the reactionary circles in the United States. With shouts about the so-called Red threat, the arms suppliers are trying to justify a further increase in arms production.

NIXON, LODGE SPLIT ON NEGRO ISSUE

Moscow, Soviet Home Service, Oct. 18, 1960, 1600 GMT--L

(Text) The incident I wish to discuss might be called a blot on the escutcheon of a noble family--if the family in question were really noble. In this case the heroes of the scandal are the two leaders of the U.S. Republican Party, Richard Nixon and Henry Cabot Lodge, who, as you know, head the ballot of the Republican Party for the election of Nov. 8.

One must say that this incident is without precedent. Electoral battles of words in America usually take place between representatives of the Republican and Democratic parties, but in this case it was representatives of one and the same party who got into a quarrel, and on the eve of the elections. In spite of the unusual nature of this event, the main point is something else, that is, the reason why Nixon and Lodge fell out. Addressing voters recently, Lodge, the vice presidential candidate, decided to use what he thought was a clever political trick. He stated that if the Republicans won, the government cabinet would include Negroes. The idea was that this promise would attract the votes of those Negroes in the Northern states who have the right to vote.

However, Nixon, the presidential candidate, at once rejected Lodge's promise. In the first place, he was obviously not pleased with the prospect of a Negro cabinet member. Second, Nixon decided that such a promise would drive the Southern racists away from the party. Lodge began insisting on his point of view, Nixon on his.

According to the American press, they got together yesterday but did not come to any agreement. As a result, the Republicans have, in the opinion of experienced observers, estranged both Negro voters and a considerable part of the voters in the Southern states.

This whole story of how Republican politicians have put themselves in a tight spot shows very obviously the complete lack of principle of bourgeois leaders, who are ready to speculate on the most urgent and painful problems to get more votes. One supposes that Nixon and Lodge will eventually come to an agreement, but their clash has opened the political backstairs of Washington for a moment, showing the unattractive face of its leaders.

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5
U.S. ELECTIONS PROVIDE NO REAL CHOICES

Moscow, in German to Germany, Oct. 19, 1960, 1245 ~~WT~~--L

(Text) The U.S. election campaign is nearing its climax; there are only three weeks remaining in the presidential election campaign. The U.S. voter is now faced with a nonsensical situation: There are elections ahead with no choice to be made. The U.S. press itself admits that it is very difficult for the U.S. voter to find any difference between Nixon and Kennedy, the respective candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties, which replace each other in office from time to time. AP states that neither party possesses real superiority.

Both Nixon and Kennedy are trying very hard to prove that they are different. Each makes promises in the press, radio, and TV broadcasts that if elected he will serve the electorate better than the other man. But the U.S. people have not failed to notice that neither presidential candidate stands for a program of peace. Both Nixon and Kennedy favor the continuation of the cold war. Both stand for a policy of strength and for an uninterrupted arms race. The only difference is that Nixon bears responsibility for the aggressive policy of the U.S. Government and for its shameful failures in his capacity of vice president, and Kennedy only in his capacity as senator.

Nixon assures the voters of his desire for peace. But who could fail to remember his backing for the Dulles policy of brinkmanship? The Eisenhower-Nixon administration tried to go even further. Let us remember that Nixon was impudent enough to claim for the United States the right to commit espionage through the U-2 flights. What is the meaning of such a claim? It means that the United States claims the privilege to commit aggression. And what is Nixon's attitude toward internal affairs such as an unstable economy, growing unemployment, a decrease in earnings, and ruin for the farmers--all that is U.S. reality? Nixon denies it; he asserts that no better policy has ever been pursued in the country. A fine policy indeed! Aggression externally, and belt-tightening domestically.

James Reston wrote in the New York TIMES that Nixon depicted things in such a way that no well-informed person could take him seriously for a single moment. As the Americans say, an empty sack will not stand by itself.

Senator Kennedy uses different tactics. He admits what his rival denies. He admits, for example, that brinkmanship has brought U.S. international prestige to its lowest ebb. Kennedy wants to prove that the U.S. Government is responsible for worsening living standards of many millions of U.S. workers and farmers and for the crises in education, the health system, and housing. Kennedy naturally gives the assurance that if he is elected he will correct everything.

But how? Kennedy's platform is so much like Nixon's that you could not tell them apart if they did not bear the different labels of the Democratic donkey and the Republican elephant. Both platforms speak of the need for substantially increasing military expenditure. Like Nixon, Kennedy favors continued manufacture and testing of nuclear weapons, aggression against Cuba, and a "carrot and stick" policy toward Latin America, and is against the liquidation of the shameful colonial system. Kennedy tries to outdo Nixon in showing hostility toward the principles of peaceful coexistence.

This being so, all promises on domestic "prosperity" made by the two presidential candidates are just bluffs. The cold war policy is bound to lead to increased taxation and higher prices, to reductions in housing construction and in civilian construction activities in general; in short, it leads to further subjection of the U.S. nation to the Pentagon and its growing appetites.

The Pentagon is not interested in party or political nuances; it has only one master, Wall Street. That is precisely the place from which threads run to both candidates. A significant detail illustrates this. Kennedy recently appointed a group of experts to advise him on national security if he should be elected president. This group is headed by Paul Nitze, a long-standing partner of the firm of Dillon, Reed, and Co. which is close to the Rockefellers.

But could Nixon possibly be opposed to the leading U.S. monopolists--say, the same Rockefeller people? The very opposite is true. It was precisely Rockefeller with whom Nixon reached agreement on the eve of the Republican convention, an agreement that forms the basis of his electoral platform.

Small wonder that the U.S. voter is now facing the elections without having any choice. As they say in the United States, the U.S. voters do not vote for, but against a candidate. Some will vote against Nixon, others against Kennedy. No other choice is open to the U.S. voter. That is what they call "democratic elections."

E A S T G E R M A N Y

LITTLE DIFFERENCE IN CANDIDATES' VIEWS

Berlin, Deutschlandsender in German to East and West Germany,
Oct. 11, 1960, 1610 GMT--L

(Commentary by U.S. correspondent George Lohr, read by announcer)

(Summary) The two U.S. presidential candidates, Richard Nixon and John Kennedy, faced each other recently in a televised debate. When it was over, the New York TIMES conducted a public opinion poll by telephone.

Most of those questioned complained that neither of the two candidates had seriously dealt with the problems of our time. It is also a fact that there are no fundamental differences in the views of the two candidates. When in four weeks the U.S. voter has to make up his mind for whom to vote, he will only know for certain that both candidates have talked a lot about their yearning for peace but neither was able to produce any positive plan to turn this yearning into a reality.

"As to Nixon, he still adheres to the disastrous foreign policy pursued by President Eisenhower. This man also asserts that under the Republican Eisenhower, U.S. prestige reached an all-time high. He continuously repeats his abusive tirades against Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and does not shrink from asserting in a silly and impudent manner that he is the only man whom the Soviet leaders fear.

"But Kennedy, too, behaves as if Khrushchev were his opponent in the elections and not Nixon. He does repeat from time to time an earlier remark that, had he been in Eisenhower's place in Paris, he would have apologized to the Soviet Union about the U-2 espionage flight so as to save the summit conference. He is cunning enough to know that this statement will make him very popular with the electorate. Kennedy, as well as Nixon, has said very little about the proceedings at the U.N. General Assembly. Both made the well-worn assertion that the Soviet proposals on the colonial problem and the disarmament problem are mere propaganda. Kennedy even went so far as to say that the next summit conference could only take place after the United States had rearmed even further. In his view, U.S. prestige reached a new low under Eisenhower. On Berlin and the German question Kennedy is giving full backing to past U.S. policy.

"The well-known Democratic politician and statesman Stevenson, who is supporting Kennedy, recently said of this candidate that if he were elected president he would abolish the veto which the Pentagon is at present exercising over U.S. foreign policy. Stevenson, as so often before, also spoke in favor of nuclear disarmament. To this day people have waited in vain for such sensible views to be uttered by Kennedy. On the contrary, while a few months ago it was generally said that if Kennedy were elected he would appoint Stevenson secretary of state, experienced journalists who meet Kennedy daily say that Kennedy seems to have changed his mind."

C Z E C H O S L O V A K I A

NOVOTNY DERIDES CONDUCT OF CAMPAIGN

Prague, Czech Home Service, Oct. 14, 1960, 1800 GMT--L

(Editor's Note: A rally was held at the Congress Hall in Fucik Park of Culture and Rest in Prague in the afternoon of Oct. 14. President Novotny delivered a report on the U.N. General Assembly, which included the following passage.)

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5

(Excerpt) The convening of the General Assembly coincided with the election campaign taking place in the United States, which is being fought out between two candidates of the monopolies, Kennedy for the Democrats and Nixon for the Republicans. During the entire first three weeks of the General Assembly, it was, however, an undisputed fact that the U.S. public, the press, and the radio were not concerned foremost with the election campaign, but with the course of the proceedings in the General Assembly. Only in the last few days were more space and attention devoted to the presidential candidates. There are reports about their meetings, their utterances, and their promises to the workers or farmers. It is worth mentioning that both are forced to concern themselves more than any of their predecessors with international questions, and with admitting the decline of U.S. prestige and with seeking ways to again build up this prestige.

During our stay in New York, the two candidates appeared on television and replied to questions and discussed matters among themselves. What they said is not interesting because neither will act according to his promises, but will faithfully carry out the desires of the monopolies. What is interesting, on the other hand, are some of the circumstances surrounding their performances and the entire election campaign. The press, radio, and television reported, for instance, that one of them demanded that the temperature in the television studio be increased, whereas the other wanted it lowered. Both demanded equal lighting, so that neither of them would outshine the other on the screen. Nixon maintained before the transmission that during the last broadcast he had been less handsome than his rival, whereas Kennedy insisted on staying as he was. (Laughter)

The press is very worried over which of the wives of the two candidates, Mrs. Nixon or Mrs. Kennedy, spends more on her clothes. As you see, comrades, the whole process of electing a U.S. president is a mere comedy which is concerned with gaining electors not by some political program, but by the most embarrassing methods of advertising. Comrade Khrushchev has rightly said, when asked by journalists whether he had viewed the Nixon-Kennedy television program, that if he were to watch a comedy, he would prefer Gogol's "The Government Inspector." (Laughter, applause)

CANDIDATES DISAGREE ON U.S. PRESTIGE

Prague, Czech Home Service, Oct. 19, 1960, 1815 GMT--L

(Excerpts) Czechoslovak citizens are less interested in the good looks and other such considerations of the two U.S. presidential candidates, and more interested in their political views and what they intend doing toward easing international tension. Let us first take Richard Nixon, who is in a much worse position than Kennedy since he has to defend the line of the Republican Party which he has been helping Eisenhower to

apply in practice for eight years. According to his view, the United States is now at the summit of its worldwide prestige and military strength. Any criticism of U.S. views on foreign political problems is denounced by Nixon as defeatism. This means that he completely identifies himself with U.S. spy flights, sabotage of international negotiations, economic and political pressure on Castro's Cuba, and all the other features of U.S. foreign policy in recent times.

Nixon is untiring in warning against what he calls the aggressiveness of international communism, but he has had to admit sorrowfully that the ideas of communism have a strong effect on the mentality of many sensible people in the United States. As he sees it, the reason for this is that today communism can be identified with the country of the largest school program and the heaviest interplanetary satellites. Nixon is a man who raised high the banner of anticommunist hysteria which fell from the hands of John Foster Dulles.

The Democratic candidate, John Kennedy, is much more cautious in his foreign policy views, but he is in no way less anticommunist than Nixon. For reasons of pre-election tactics, he is sharply criticizing Republican policy. He says quite openly that U.S. prestige in the world is far from glorious, and he shows apprehension about the Soviet economic successes and advanced rocket techniques. He criticizes the shortcomings of the U.S. educational system and the fact that social services play the part of Cinderella in the U.S. budget. Kennedy complains that the Republican administration fails to respond sufficiently to the so-called Soviet economic challenge.

At this time one cannot gain a clear picture of the chances of the one candidate or the other. It seems that Kennedy is slightly better off, for he has the most agreeable features and displays more realistic opinions. But against him is the fact that he is a Catholic. Nixon is a Quaker and as such is more acceptable. But the American people's experience with the Republican administration is a heavy burden for the Vice President. We shall have to wait and see. Television productions or other equally important political factors can substantially change the prospects of the two candidates on the very eve of election day.

By the way, it is not essential whether Kennedy or Nixon sits in the White House. A decisive turn in U.S. policy can be brought about only by the American people's successful struggle against U.S. monopolies.

B U L G A R I A

NIKON AND KENNEDY BOTH OPPOSE PEACE

Sofia, Bulgarian Home Service, Oct. 17, 1960, 1600 GMT--M

(Text) The election campaign in the United States continues. The press, radio, and television call on Americans to vote for Nixon or Kennedy. The Republicans praise their candidate by attacking Kennedy, the Democratic candidate, for not having sufficient experience for the high post of president. On the other hand, the Democrats are not inclined to pardon Nixon, blaming him for the failures of the Eisenhower government in foreign policy.

In their attacks on each other, both candidates make use of their oratorical gifts, mainly on matters of foreign policy. Both Nixon and Kennedy have gone to the point of making declarations on matters which are no concern at all of Americans. Thus, in his declaration the day before yesterday, Kennedy again attacked Nixon and the government for showing lack of foresight in their policy toward Cuba. He tried to present the struggle of the Cuban people for freedom and independence as a mistake of American foreign policy. Without feeling ashamed of his ridiculous argument, Kennedy charged that the American Government, during the dictatorial Batista regime, failed to give the Cuban people an opportunity to clearly understand the love of the United States for freedom. To prove this love for "freedom," Kennedy called the handful of crooks of the Batista regime now in the United States the "representatives of the real voice of Cuba." It is clear that with such political discoveries Kennedy wants to win to his side those who lost their factories and plantations in Cuba and who are against the relaxation of international tension.

In order not to fall behind his opponent, Nixon declared in Los Angeles that if elected he would start a crusade for peace, with the cooperation of Eisenhower. This policy, which in no way differs from the current one, led to the failure of the Paris summit meeting, proclaimed espionage flights as official U.S. policy, and resumed nuclear weapons testing. Despite the different colors with which they decorate their speeches, both presidential candidates believe in the same creed--the continuing intensification of international tension.

By this Kennedy and Nixon are proving that they are serving not the American people, who are for peace, but the big magnates who do not wish to lose the business of arms production. One cannot deny the juggler's dexterity shown by both candidates in pronouncing the word "peace," but as far as the establishment of real peace throughout the world is concerned, it is absolutely clear that both of them are against it.

H U N G A R Y

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY HARMS PRESTIGE

Budapest, in English to North America, Oct. 20, 1960, 0001 GMT--E

(Text) The current debate in the U.S. election campaign centers around whether the United States has lost prestige in the world. Kennedy claims that it has. Why, he asks, should the new nations of Asia and Africa look to Russia? He gives as one of the reasons why they should not the fact that, in his opinion, the American Constitution and Declaration of Independence are still the most revolutionary documents ever written.

Nixon denies Kennedy's accusation and, to support Nixon's denial, President Eisenhower points to the fact that many government heads are still visiting the United States and the United States has not lost a vote in the United Nations. It would be a mistake to regard this as a passing issue of election campaigning. It is rather--as Walter Lippmann, New York HERALD TRIBUNE columnist, pointed out--a problem of supreme importance to the United States and, in my opinion, not only to the United States but to all of us. Quite apart from the election campaign and how the issue is being used, and although I completely disagree with some of Kennedy's solutions, he will nevertheless have done a world service in raising this issue if it will result in that long-overdue reappraisal of U.S. foreign policy.

If the United States wants to regain some of that lost prestige, it must change its policy to conform with the changing situation of the present-day world. Whether the new administration is Republican or Democratic, it will have to come to terms with this new situation. If not, it will not only keep on losing prestige but also place the United States politically, economically, and morally in a most disadvantageous position. Perhaps that should be of little concern to any but the American people. If that were the only danger, perhaps it would be of little concern, but it is not.

The danger has been and continues to be that, refusing to take into account the new situation, the United States has been pursuing a policy which is detrimental politically and economically to other countries and which can lead to war. It is all this that accounts for the U.S. prestige shrinking in the world.

Walter Lippmann pointed out that the turning point in world relations came in 1949, when the Soviet Union not only broke the U.S. monopoly of nuclear weapons but showed the world that out of the devastation of war the USSR had achieved an economy capable of the highest feats of technology and production. The story of the 1950's, Lippmann wrote, is the

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5
story of U.S. failure to rise to this challenge and achieve a foreign policy for what was becoming a wholly new balance of power in the world and a wholly new situation. It followed, rather, a policy of entanglements with Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek, and Dr. Adenauer.

It is in this situation that Kennedy and other critics of U.S. policy must look for and find the reasons why the new nations of Africa and Asia are looking to the Soviet Union. Support for Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, and the U.S. role in China, Japan, and Korea account a great deal for the alienation of the Asian and African countries, while the tremendous achievements of the Soviet Union and its willingness to aid these new nations with no strings attached have been among the inspirations for their struggle. Averill Harriman recognized this fact when he pointed out, "The most disturbing aspect of the Soviet Union's rapid economic development from a poor peasant community in the brief space of one generation is the effect it may have on peoples of other underdeveloped areas." Harriman regards this as a disturbing factor. What is far more disturbing is that the fear of this effect accounts for U.S. cold war policy.

On Dec. 5, 1959, Allen W. Dulles, director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, warned the annual meeting of the Congress of American Industries: "The danger from the peaceful coexistence program of the Soviet bloc will increase if the Russians feel free to shift a substantial part of their spending from military to non-military measures." This statement puts into a nutshell an attitude which is very widespread in high business and government circles. It is the fear of coexistence, due to the belief that peaceful coexistence with socialism will lead to U.S. defeat in the underdeveloped countries. This, by the way, is one of the major obstacles to disarmament.

As I have already said, I do not agree with many of Kennedy's solutions. He does not, for example, propose to break with Chiang Kai-shek. All he proposes is that the offshore islands should not be defended, because they are indefensible and not because he regards the fundamental policy as wrong. He offers no real program of trade and exchange based on mutual respect of sovereign rights, but wants to rest on the revolutionary nature of the Declaration of Independence. Nobody will argue the revolutionary nature of that document--the fact is that Ho Chi Minh, president of the Vietnam Democratic Republic, used it as a guide for his country's constitution. But the American revolutionary war of independence was one thing and American imperialism is another. The one can still inspire, but the other is being rejected in many parts of the world.

It is not the documents of the past but the deeds of the present that affect the attitude of the new nations toward the United States. Kennedy does not contribute much if that is all he can contribute, but if the current debates result in a genuine reappraisal and if the present or

future Government of the United States sets out from a new world situation, taking into account the demands of the new nations, then not only will it affect American prestige in the world but also eliminate a number of afflictions which exist today.

Y U G O S L A V I A

PROTESTANT DRIVE AGAINST KENNEDY SEEN

Belgrade, Serbian Home Service, Oct. 20, 1960, 1400 GMT--M

(Text) It is expected that a public campaign against the election of the Catholic Kennedy as the American president will be started on the eve of elections in all Protestant churches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Conservative Protestant pastors, who are actively working against Kennedy because he is Catholic, will hold so-called Reformation Sunday on Oct. 30 in honor of the anniversary of Martin Luther's rebellion against the Pope and will preach anti-Kennedy and anti-Catholic sermons. This eruption of religious feelings in the concluding stages of the electoral campaign is considered dangerous to the Democratic candidate, although the liberal Protestants, ministers of other American churches, and headquarters of both parties formally denounce the exploitation of Kennedy's religious beliefs for electioneering purposes.

The reported anti-Kennedy meetings in the Protestant churches constitute a follow-up to the months-long activities involving anti-Catholic brochures, leaflets, pamphlets, printed matter, and various sermons from the Protestant church pulpits. One of the direct consequences of the activities is the fact that all Catholics in the United States, numbering about 41 million, side with Kennedy, although a majority of them had voted for the Republicans. Although this religious campaign is being officially denounced, it is considered that it may have a decisive influence on the outcome of the presidential elections.

C O M M U N I S T C H I N A

KENNEDY THREATENS AGGRESSION IN CUBA

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia, Oct. 16, 1960, 1547 GMT--W

(Text) Peking, Oct. 16--U.S. Democratic presidential candidate John Kennedy at Johnstown, Pennsylvania, yesterday presented a "five-point program" for aggression against Cuba, according to a New York report. He openly advocated a further increase in the strength of the Organization of American States, which serves as an instrument for U.S. control over Latin American countries, and intensification of aggressive and subversive activities against Cuba, so that it would be "restricted, isolated, and left to die on the vine."

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5

Kennedy complained that the measures of the Eisenhower administration to consistently nurture the Batista dictatorial regime had brought "major disaster" to U.S. foreign policy. "The whole Western Hemisphere security system" is "drastically threatened," and an "incredibly dangerous development" is now taking place in Cuba.

Kennedy then talked about his "five-point program" for stepping up aggression and subversion against Cuba. He asserted that the United States wants to continue to occupy by force the base at Guantanamo and to pose threats against Cuba's nationalization of some U.S. enterprises which had plundered the Cuban people. Kennedy advocated that the Organization of American States should be "given real strength and stature" to "resist any further communist penetration." He also bluntly declared intensified support for the Cuban rebels and "anti-Castro forces" in other countries to carry out conspiratorial activities to subvert Cuba, and advocated the stepping up of subversive propaganda by the notorious "Voice of America" against the Cuban people.

The reactionary American Legion national commander, Martin McKneally, also viciously attacked the Cuban revolution at a press conference on Oct. 14. He attacked the Cuban Government under the pretext of "communism," alleging that the Cuban revolution had been "communist-oriented" since its very beginning. He asserted that the U.S. Government should sever diplomatic relations with Cuba.

NIKON MAPS PLANS TO RAISE WORLD TENSION

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia, Oct. 16, 1960, 1943 GMT--B

(Text) Peking, Oct. 16--U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon advocated on Oct. 14 that the United States mobilize all its forces for the "cold war" and prepare for "hot war," according to reports from Los Angeles.

In an election campaign speech in Los Angeles, Nixon asserted that it was now time for the United States "to launch a new effort, an all-out offensive for peace and freedom." He presented a plan calling for the "mobilization" of U.S. forces in all fields for struggle against the socialist camp. He declared that, if he is elected, he would immediately convene in the military field a council of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the secretaries of the three services, plus the ranking military commanders at home and abroad to "reexamine" the Soviet policy and the rapid pace of technological change, and, in the light of these factors, to "reevaluate" U.S. strategy in the nonmilitary fields. He would also call a meeting for the first week of December of representatives of "a cross-section" of American life to discuss the question of how the U.S. Government would mobilize the "total resources" of the "free world."

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5

In the diplomatic sphere, Nixon proposed, beginning next spring, a series of four "regional meetings" (West European, Latin American, African, and Asian conferences) with the participation of the heads of government. These conferences would study the questions of "strengthening" the "United Nations" and "strengthening the free nations, politically, economically, socially, and militarily." In addition, he favored the exploration during the December meeting of the NATO Council of Ministers of the expansion of the spring meeting of this bloc into a summit conference of all heads of NATO governments.

Nixon also declared that Eisenhower had agreed to be his "adviser" if he is elected. In order to justify his plan to step up war preparations, Nixon furiously slandered the socialist countries, especially the heads of government of these countries. He alleged that "communist leaders" have engaged in "rude and threatening conduct" at the current U.N. General Assembly session. He even compared the leaders of socialist countries with "Hitler and Mussolini." He did his utmost to advocate the adoption of a stiff position against the socialist countries.

Nixon admitted that the U.S. ruling cliques "are going to have trouble" in carrying out their policy. He tried to refute the contention of Democratic presidential candidate John F. Kennedy that U.S. "prestige" was at an "all-time low." But he said reluctantly: "I certainly wouldn't say that American prestige is not in difficulty in some parts of the world."

KENNEDY SHOWS NAIVETE ON ISLANDS ISSUE

Peking, in Mandarin to Taiwan, Oct. 18, 1300 GMT--B

(Text) U.S. Senator and Democratic candidate for the presidency Kennedy recently presented a talk on an NBC television program regarding the so-called defense of Taiwan. In his talk, he expressed skepticism regarding the shady policy adopted by U.S. President Eisenhower concerning the Chinese offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Kennedy said that Quemoy and Matsu were not vital to the U.S. occupation of Taiwan. He held the view that, in order to deceitfully win over the American people and so-called world public opinion for the support of the U.S. encroachment on Taiwan, the United States should compel the Chiang Kai-shek clique in Taiwan to abandon Quemoy and Matsu and draw a so-called sharp and clear line of defense in the Taiwan Strait.

Kennedy's talk has once again exposed the plot of the U.S. aggressive bloc of isolating Taiwan and of creating two Chinas. It is known to all that politicians of the U.S. Republican and Democratic parties have been harping on the so-called two Chinas theme in order to win the next presidential election. For example, U.S. Congressman Bowles, foreign affairs adviser to Kennedy, published an absurd article in the

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5

U.S. magazine FOREIGN AFFAIRS not long ago on reconsidering the China question. In the face of the powerful CPR, Bowles cannot but admit that our central government has been ruling the China mainland in a stable manner and that the United States, by refusing formal recognition of New China and by rejecting the restoration of New China's position in the United Nations has caused disagreement and a predicament. On the other hand, however, Bowles still indulged in the wishful thinking of setting up a so-called "Sino-Formosan nation." In order to achieve this shameless goal, Bowles also advocated neutralizing the offshore islands close to the China mainland.

There are a great number of people in the two American political parties who share Bowles' views. A recent UPI news report disclosed that a large number of leaders of the Democratic Party, like the Republican leaders, insisted upon the encroachment of Taiwan and the creation of two Chinas. They also demanded that the U.S. Government adopt what is called more positive action to force both the Nationalists on Taiwan and the Chinese Communists into agreeing that the Taiwan Strait is the boundary line of China, so as to permanently divide the country in two.

Kennedy's absurd talk about abandoning Quemoy and Matsu, continuing the occupation of Taiwan, and drawing a line of defense in the Taiwan Strait is another substantial proof of this. The U.S. aggressive bloc, in fact, indulged in this kind of wishful thinking as early as Jan. 24, 1955. In his so-called message to Congress, U.S. President Eisenhower proposed a so-called cease-fire in the Taiwan Strait under the auspices of the United Nations. In August 1955, when the Sino-U.S. ambassadorial talks began, the United States again wishfully considered demanding that China relinquish the use of force for the liberation of Taiwan. In September 1958, when the PLA bombarded Quemoy, the United States again proposed a so-called cease-fire in the Taiwan Strait.

The wishful thinking cherished by the U.S. aggressive bloc was the idea of asking the Chinese people to relinquish the right to liberate their sacred territory of Taiwan. They wanted China to give up its own territory of Taiwan so that the United States could occupy it permanently. It was reported that the conditions offered by the United States were that the United States would recognize China's rights in the United Nations and neutralize the Chinese offshore islands.

When the Chinese people responded to such an intrigue with unreserved exposure and merciless denunciation, the United States then started to exert pressure on the Chiang Kai-shek clique on Taiwan. Since the Chiang-Dulles talk in October 1958, the United States has been repeatedly urging the Chiang Kai-shek clique to cut down its armed forces and to withdraw its forces from Quemoy and Matsu. It is obvious that in so doing, the U.S. aggressive bloc is attempting to isolate Taiwan and to create a situation for the United States to rule Taiwan by drawing a line in the Taiwan Strait so as to achieve its goal for permanently dividing China and occupying Taiwan.

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040024-5

(Editor's Note: The above commentary was also carried on two other Peking to Taiwan broadcasts--at 2300 GMT, Oct. 18, and at 1300 GMT Oct. 19. As of 1652 GMT, Oct. 19, no monitored Peking home service, international service, regional, or NCNA casts have carried the commentary or otherwise mentioned the subject.)

NIXON, KENNEDY URGE STEPS AGAINST CUBA

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia, Oct. 19, 1960, 1426 GMT--W

(Text) Peking, Oct. 19--U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon yesterday advocated that the United States step up measures for intervention in Cuba, according to a Washington report.

Speaking at the American Legion convention at Miami Beach, Nixon viciously attacked Castro's revolutionary regime as "an intolerable cancer" within the Western Hemisphere. He proposed that the "free nations" of the West move promptly to intervene in Cuba under the pretext of preventing "further Soviet penetration." Nixon was especially displeased with the Cuban people's takeover of the enterprises of U.S. monopoly capital in Cuba in order to safeguard their state sovereignty. He howled: "Our goal must be to quarantine the Castro regime" and "we will very promptly take the strongest possible economic measures" to "counter Cuba."

Speaking at the same gathering, U.S. Democratic Party presidential candidate John Kennedy also cried that the United States would speed up its policy of aggression against Cuba. He especially proposed that the United States expand its influence by such means as "economic aid," and the training of "future leaders in Africa, Asia, and Latin America," as well as sympathy with the national independence movement in these places. All these hypocritical measures are aimed to fool the people of these countries. He held that only such methods could avoid renewal of the Cuban revolution on the "doorstep of the United States." On Oct. 15, Kennedy presented a "five-point program" for aggression and subversion in Cuba, advocating openly that Cuba would be "restricted, isolated, and left to die on the vine" by the United States.

Two days later the U.S. State Department issued a statement expressing its outrage at the execution of two U.S. spies by the Cuban Government. Doing its best to cover up the U.S. conspiracy to subvert the Cuban Government, the State Department in its statement minimized the event as private acts of "individual Americans." "The consequences of demagogic exploitation of such individual acts, as far as the U.S. position is concerned, are also potentially very serious," the statement said in threatening the Cuban Government.

U N I T E D K I N G D O M

KENNEDY MAY HAVE TRIGGERED GOLD RUSH

London, General Overseas Service in English, Oct. 24, 1960, 0150 GMT--E

(Excerpts) The sudden rise last week in the price of gold is commented upon by a number of papers. The TIMES says gold comes into its own when faith is being lost in currency, and last week's flurry was a culmination of doubts about the American dollar. The dollar has been under suspicion for some time and the feeling that Senator Kennedy, with a far more inflationary program than Vice President Nixon, was gaining ground in the presidential election campaign added considerably to the doubts. Since the American Treasury denied it has any intention of changing the value of the dollar, and the denial that Senator Kennedy if elected would also have any similar intention, some of the gold fever has subsided, but it is not yet over. The truth of the matter is that there is a fundamental lack of balance between the American economy and those of several European countries; and until this is put right currency disturbances are bound to arise.

The SCOTSMAN says: "If it became clear that any undue rise in gold would bring out a flood of metal from Fort Knox, one could hardly imagine the speculators persisting in their efforts to force up the price. The governor of the Bank of England has commented that gold and currency reserves are there to meet the situation caused by sudden international movements of funds. He also suggested a freer use of the reserves of the International Monetary Fund. Is it too much to hope that one day it could act in such crisis times as the present?" the paper ends.

F R A N C E

KENNEDY'S STAND ON ALGERIA DISCUSSED

Paris, AFP, Radioteletype in French to Agency Offices, Oct. 17, 1960, 0412 GMT--E

(Excerpts) Paris--L'AURORE says that France would have found a solution to the Algerian problem a long time ago had the conflict not been poisoned from the outside. "This applies to Bourguiba, who talks, keeps talking, and now seems to be turning to the White House--and not without concern about its future occupant. Mr. Kennedy is certainly free to take any position he wants on this question, even if he does not know much about it. But when he speaks of bad faith in the negotiations, one may ask whether he means France. If so, his friends should advise him that, in the interest of his authority

on international affairs, he should be a little more careful with language which some day may be that of a president. If the use of shades of meaning is foreign to him, it is to be feared that we and the Americans will have to be prepared for quite some surprises should he become president."

PARIS-JOUR says: "Noting that it is impossible to oppose the communists in the name of Algerian independence, Bourguiba is turning toward the NATO powers. What will be the French Government's reactions to this new peril, and what will be those of our Atlantic allies? General de Gaulle does not seem to change his position. He will not make any move until after the end of the U.N. debate on Algeria. However, the new element of Chinese-Soviet aid may make him reexamine the situation. Our allies probably would have liked to have waited until after the American presidential elections before taking up the problem raised by the Tunisian head of state. They could, however, get together with Paris in order to face the danger to the free world since Africa is becoming ever more clearly the target of Moscow and Peking. This is the position taken by Democratic candidate Kennedy."

W E S T G E R M A N Y

NIKON'S STAND ON ODER-NEISSE LINE NOTED

Hamburg, DPA, Radioteletype in German to Authorized Recipients,
Oct. 22, 1960, 1300 GMT--L

(Summary) The opinion expressed by Richard Nixon in an election speech that the Oder-Neisse line must be regarded as Germany's eastern frontier was received with reserve in Bonn government circles, which stressed that they wanted to avoid interfering in the American election campaign. The SPD executive and the CDU-CSU parliamentary group refused to make any comment.

A spokesman of the Free Democrats said that the statements made in the American election campaign should not be scrutinized too closely. Nixon's visit to Warsaw has obviously helped to influence his present remarks on the question of Germany's eastern territories.

Nixon's statements were described by Seiboth, chairman of the BHE, as a matter "to be taken very seriously." If official American policy endorses the view that it is allied militarily with Germany but politically with Poland, this could gravely undermine German trust in American policy, Seiboth said.

Schneider, deputy chairman of the German Party, regretted Nixon's remarks about the Oder-Neisse line. In Schneider's view questions of

international law should not be made the subject of an election campaign, the more so when in this way the opinion hitherto upheld by the American Government is being made open to question.

Clarification Welcomed

Hamburg, DPA, Radioteletype in German to Authorized Recipients, Oct. 22, 1960, 1719 GMT--L

(Text) A Federal Government spokesman today welcomed the fact that, following U.S. Vice President Nixon's remarks on the Oder-Neisse line, a spokesman of the U.S. State Department clarified the U.S. Government's attitude to that question. The State Department spokesman said that the decisive factor for his government, now as in the past, is that the Polish western frontier can only be fixed in a peace settlement with all of Germany. The Federal Government spokesman said: "The attitude of the U.S. Government is known to Bonn and it was not expected to change in any way."

S W E D E N

SWEDISH NEWSPAPERS SEE NIXON AHEAD

Stockholm, in English to North America, Oct. 17, 1960, 1400 GMT--E

(Text) One of the subjects beginning to attract increasing editorial comment is the presidential election campaign in the United States. Noting that election day is just around the corner, several Swedish newspapers refer to the American public opinion polls which give the two candidates an equal chance. This verdict is not shared, however, by a number of commentators, who claim that the signs point to Nixon as having the edge over his opponent.

The Social Democratic OREBRO-KURIKEN, for instance, says that the very fact that the outcome is regarded as uncertain is sufficient proof that Nixon has made considerable progress in recent weeks. The reason for this is explained by the paper in these words: "Nixon's election campaign has kept major world political issues in the forefront, particularly the struggle between East and West. In this context he has stressed the point that because of his greater experience in world affairs he is more qualified to face up to the problems of the times. The Vice President also makes the claim that under his leadership U.S. foreign policy will be pursued with force, energy, and determination."

Discussing the fear that Nixon's association with the unsuccessful foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration will prove to be a big handicap, this newspaper concludes: "Paradoxically, Senator Kennedy

is prevented, by the tactical considerations of his campaign, from indulging in any criticism of foreign and defense policy with the force and intensity that are needed for the good of the nation. This can be partly attributed to Vice President Nixon's oft-repeated assertion that all is well with American policy and that the situation is quite satisfactory. Statements of this nature are, of course, exactly what the voters like to hear. There is also another factor to consider, probably the most important of all. Any attack on current American policy is almost immediately construed as a personal attack on President Eisenhower. The President continues to enjoy widespread popularity and sympathy; and whenever he comes under fire, it seems as if the whole nation rallies to his aid. We have only to recall the reaction to the recent assaults launched on him by Soviet Premier Khrushchev to appreciate the validity of this argument. Senator Kennedy, therefore, knows he has to tread the path of criticism very carefully and skillfully."

The Social Democratic FOLKET, published in the steel center of Eskilstuna, holds similar views. Its editorial says: "Everyone is aware that Nixon cannot hope to bask in the same aura of personal good will as President Eisenhower. Nevertheless the Republican candidate is still in a stronger tactical position than his rival. It is a case of the voters preferring to hear the more pleasant but boastful claims from the Vice President of the strength and success of U.S. policy than the unpleasant truth from Senator Kennedy about economic stagnation and shortcomings in American political leadership."

DAGENS NYHETER finds it surprising that Kennedy has been accused of being unpatriotic because he complained of U.S. weaknesses during Khrushchev's visit to the General Assembly. The paper says: "There is no real reason why Kennedy should be obliged to soft-pedal his criticism of the administration. The fact that the Soviet Premier happened to be in the United States at the time is of no consequence whatsoever. We can be sure that the Soviet leader is well-informed about developments in the United States and has no need to turn his ear to the election campaign to find out what is happening. Be that as it may, the Democrats still appear to be concerned about the effect Khrushchev is likely to have on voters. His attacks on the President may swing many voters over to the support of Nixon as a defiant gesture of loyalty."

DAGENS NYHETER concludes by suggesting another election factor that may be causing furrowed brows in the Democratic camp. It says: "The Republican vice presidential candidate, Henry Cabot Lodge, has had a surprisingly good reception during his campaign tour, and in some cases the warmth of it has exceeded that accorded to Nixon. It is evident now that the nomination of Cabot Lodge for Vice President has been a very wise move. The Republicans unquestionably now have a strong and experienced political team in Nixon and Lodge."

STOCKHOLMS-TIDNINGEN points out that organized labor is backing Kennedy, although this does not necessarily mean that union members will vote for him. Adlai Stevenson, for example, lost in 1952 and 1956 despite the support of the AFL-CIO. The paper adds: "There is much, however, to support the view of the AFL-CIO that it is time for a change in the administration. Unemployment is growing and Washington is doing nothing about it. The number of jobless during the next three months is expected to total more than five million."

T U N I S I A

PAPER DERIDES KENNEDY ALGERIAN VIEWS

Tunis, Tunisian Home Service in Arabic, Oct. 21, 1960, 0530 GMT--L

(Text) AL-AMAL comments on the attitude of Democratic presidential candidate Kennedy toward the Algerian problem, dealing in particular with the denial by his spokesman of the statement attributed to him by the Tunisian ACTION AFRIQUE.

The paper says: "The main point in this matter is the fact that the denial was accompanied by expressions of support for France regarding the Algerian problem. Kennedy's spokesman expressed this when he said that candidate Kennedy feels that France, under the leadership of General de Gaulle, is progressing toward solution of its problems in Algeria.

"A declaration of this type at this particular time has unique political significance, especially since it embodied ideas which the entire world discarded a long time ago. The statement brings to mind the old gambit that Algeria is a French problem and that France will find a solution to it."

I S R A E L

ISRAEL DOES NOT MEDDLE IN U.S. ELECTION

Jerusalem, Israeli Home Service, in Hebrew, Oct. 16, 1130 GMT--M

(Text) DAVAR (Histadrut) refers to a publication issued by the campaign headquarters of the Republican candidate for the U.S. presidency. This publication was based on an editorial in the Israeli paper YEDIOT AHARONOT (Independent), which criticized Kennedy and expressed support for Nixon. DAVAR objects to this publication and says that we have to make it clear to the American public that this Israeli "propaganda" is absurd and that Israel does not take sides in the contest for the election of the U.S. president.

DAVAR emphasizes that the Israeli press is no less free than the American press to write whatever it likes, and if a daily paper finds it proper to adopt an attitude regarding the elections in the United States, it cannot be prevented from doing so. However, one should not regard this as a reliable expression of Israeli public opinion. The Israeli public, DAVAR concludes, has not adopted and will not adopt any stand on the elections in the United States and is convinced that, whoever may be elected, America's friendship toward Israel will continue forever.

C U B A

LODGE MAKES DEMAGOGIC NEGRO VOTE BID

Havana, Radio Mambi, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 13, 1960, 2330 GMT--F

(Summary) Henry Cabot Lodge, the Republican vice presidential candidate and one of the hunting dogs that the Yankee imperialists have had in the United Nations, said that a U.S. Negro should be appointed to a U.S. cabinet post. Cabot Lodge made his demagogic, political, and hypocritical statement during a tour of Harlem in New York. We really believe that Cabot Lodge's statement is an attempt to mollify the New York Negroes, who remain out of politics and who showed their repudiation of Yankee imperialism when they gathered on hundreds of occasions to hail Fidel Castro, the great leader of the victorious Cuban revolution. The Harlem Negroes went even further on those occasions in their repudiation of the imperialists when they shouted "Cuba si, Yanquis no," the fighting slogan today of all the Latin American people. How can Lodge talk of wanting a Negro in the cabinet when the U.S. Negroes do not even have the right to think freely?

KENNEDY MORE REACTIONARY THAN NIXON

Havana, Radio Mambi, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 17, 1960, 2330 GMT--F

(Summary) It seems that Kennedy is going out of his way to prove that he is even more reactionary than Nixon. In an election speech in Houston day before yesterday, the millionaire Senator compared Nixon and Mikoyan and went so far as to almost hint that Nixon and "Ike" were deliberately playing the communists' game. At the rate things are going, Kennedy will accuse Nixon of being a dangerous communist, ask that the hydrogen bomb be used against Cuba, and request the shooting of all the unemployed to solve the employment problem before the election campaign is over.

Those who threw tomatoes at Nixon in Caracas because they believed that they were in the presence of the most classic and exemplary reactionary in the world could not suspect that Mr. Nixon is almost a leftist in comparison to Kennedy, nay, a dangerous anarchist, a Cominform agent, an ally of Fidel Castro, a proletarian. As Kennedy says in private, "Nixon may have his little million hidden some place, but what is that compared with my pop's 400 millions?"

Echoes Nixon, Eisenhower

Havana, Radio Progreso, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 18, 1960, 1710 GMT--E

(Summary) Various subjects are of interest today. For instance, Mr. Kennedy's five points, which amount to a proposal for direct intervention in Cuba. For reasons of time, we shall simply point out that Kennedy's five points are the same as Nixon's five points, which in turn are the same as Eisenhower's five points. This is simply the same song sung in three different voices, all equally disagreeable and off tune.

KENNEDY REVEALS HIS IGNORANCE OF CUBA

Havana, Union Radio Network, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 18, 1960, 1700 GMT--F

(Summary) The donkey brayed again and said awful things. John F. Kennedy spoke on Cuba, but he should be careful not to slip, for he may end up eating grass. Fidel certainly knew what he was talking about when he called him an "illiterate millionaire," because one has to be very illiterate to keep saying the same idiotic thing over and over again. Kennedy, who evidently is nothing but a fool and an idiotic gringo, has just proposed a five-point plan to deal with the revolutionary Cuban Government, according to which they are going to eat us raw, without even chewing us.

We could reply to Kennedy's insolent braying with two points taken from Fidel's speech: The revolutionary laws are eternal; the revolution will remain. What else can we say to this colonial puppet? Mr. Kennedy must think that the Cuban people do not know what they are doing and where they are going. He thinks that the Cuban worker is ignorant and that the Cuban farmer is a nothing and deserves nothing. Kennedy also thinks that, since the Cubans are ignorant, they do not deserve the freedom they are now enjoying. He does not seem to realize that the world is changing and that today even the worst-informed Cuban can give Kennedy a lesson in true democracy.

This Kennedy should read the Havana Declaration before he brays because when this ignorant illiterate says that the voice of Cuba is that of Masferrer, Carratala, Ventura, and the other murderers and criminals, he is insulting the Cuban people. Nixon is just as bad as Kennedy.

We should not worry about Kennedy's braying, nor should we worry about any trumpeting that Nixon may do. There is no difference between the two. It is well that we know about them so that we shall be able to deal with them in the future. Let us remember that they are the wooden legs of imperialism and let us remember that with or without wooden legs, we shall win.

NIXON ANNOUNCES U.S. BOYCOTT OF CUBA

Havana, Radio Progreso, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 19, 1960, 1700 GMT--E

(Summary) Nixon, the most stupid vice president in the world, has declared that the empire is planning to take energetic economic reprisals against Cuba. These reprisals are to begin today, Oct. 19, 1960. Imperialism appears determined to launch a frontal attack against Cuba, at least on the economic level. So far the measures it has taken have been partial. The suppression of the sugar quota, despite its gravity, was a partial measure. The same occurred with the petroleum trade. A short time ago the New York TIMES announced that shipments of machine parts to Cuba would be suspended. This already pointed the way to direct aggression.

Now all supplies of raw materials or manufactured products are to be cut off. We shall lose the main supplier of our market. This amounts to attempting to strangle us economically. This policy has a name--"boycott." It would be stupid to deny or evade the gravity of this announcement. The United States is still the supplier of products essential to our economy, particularly with regard to machinery. Its supplies are essential to all, or almost all, of the Cuban industrial system. To abolish replacement parts for machinery, to mention only one item, already implies a crisis situation. This boycott is the most violent and grave aggression imperialism has yet launched against us, an aggression which could be exceeded only by direct military aggression. Imperialism has declared open war on us.

This is the situation, viewed in elementary, concrete terms. Imperialism counts on its aggression to conquer us or at least to make us ready for concessions. It is trying to bend our glorious national resistance in order to deal, in the immediate future, even harsher and more final blows.

But this is reckoning without the revolution. Our revolution has already escaped unharmed from grave situations with a fighting song on its lips. This present critical prospect will not frighten it nor cause it to lose its head. Cuba has reserve resources with which to resist and win. On the one hand, it has powerful friends in the world. On the other, at home, the people are ready to resist and overcome economic difficulties. This will demand a policy of austerity but the people will not spare any sacrifice.

The possible difficulties arising from this new position must be faced. National production and national income will be affected. It is possible that the infuriated giant with feet of clay may desperately sacrifice its own people and the economic interests of its own country, radically eliminating Cuban sugar from the U.S. market. This prospect is possible in view of its insane death throes. Hence it is also possible that this angry, aggressive, bestial, criminal policy may turn into a boomerang under certain circumstances.

In any case, Cuba will feel the effects of this cruel war, but it will not be conquered. It will emerge victorious. History is on our side. The revolutionary government has already foreseen this historic emergency and has studied how to rise above it; and it has a people who need only to be told: The enemy wants to starve us to death and through hunger force us to surrender. Let us show them that we can survive on roots and plants. We can survive and triumph.

The monster has launched this assault because it is desperate, and its desperation is not transitory. It is the desperation of death. We, on the other hand, are now beginning to live fully and we are going to fight and to win.

Nixon Behind Embargo

Havana, Radio Rebelde Network, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 19, 1960,
1745 GMT--F

(Summary) Shortly before the U.S. Government placed an embargo on the shipments of almost every U.S. product to Cuba, Richard Nixon, the stupid Republican presidential candidate, suggested the step in order to prevent, according to him, the spread of the Castro regime's influence in Latin America. It seems to us that it is now impossible to do this because the influence of the Cuban revolution has already spread through Latin America and the world. The hero of the eastern Cuban mountains has already unmasked the Yankee thieves.

The U.S. Commerce Department today banned the export of most U.S. products to Cuba, but this will not frighten the Cuban people because the gringos of international piracy have been waging an aggressive policy

against the revolutionary government and our people are determined to fight to the death for our independence. Yet the United States is still helping the Dominican hyena by buying sugar from him, and shipping him oil, in spite of the agreement reached at the San Jose Conference.

Champion of Despoilers

Havana, Radio Mambi, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 19, 1960, 2330 GMT--E

(Summary) Nixon is the great champion of the despoilers and the protege of some 200 monopolies which have risen as a result of over 50 years of exploitation and plunder. He is the servant of the multimillionaire oil companies which have accumulated their dollars by stealing the land, life, and dignity of the Indians, the Arabs, and the Africans. He is the errand boy of the large fruit companies whose owners travel about in yachts paid for by the sweat and blood of the Central American people and the death of thousands of their children.

Nixon, the great champion of despoilers whose wallets are stuffed with the money stolen from others, complains about the plunder of property in Cuba. According to Nixon, when our revolutionary government gives land to the farmers, homes to our people, and the plants to the workers it is committing plunder. If we took everything away from the people and gave it to the monopolists we would then be defending property. Hypocrites, vipers, as Jesus called the Pharisees.

ELECTIONS OFFER LITTLE HOPE OF CHANGE

Havana, Radio Rebelde, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 19, 1960, 0001 GMT--E/F

(Summary) Poor North American people! What lies ahead for them are days even darker than the ones they are now going through. In accordance with representative democratic procedures, presidential elections will be held in November. The American peoples have had to endure stupidity and the open warfare of imperialism in its most aggressive form during the eight years of the Eisenhower administration, and it cannot be said that the forthcoming elections will offer any hope of peace and prosperity.

Both Republicans and Democrats, monopolistic parties, have as candidates two examples of stupidity, ignorance, and imperialistic insolence--Nixon and Kennedy. Here are two names for history. In the world of tomorrow, pictures of these two fossils will be found in museums as examples of what must never be done in politics. Nixon and Kennedy, two ludicrous imperialistic figures. Pictorial captions will read: "Candidates for the presidency of what was the Yankee empire in 1960."

But let us return to the world of today, a world in which decadent U.S. imperialism exists, a world in which imperialists attack countries like Cuba, which is liberating itself from their bloody and filthy influences. The candidates of both parties, equal in structure and philosophy, which divide the U.S. electorate into two camps and constitute the highest form of fascist totalitarianism, have engaged in a genuine contest of stupidities over world problems and over Cuba in particular.

Less than a month from election time, we express our commiseration for the poor American people, poor in every respect, because their lot cannot improve but may worsen. We tell the American people that the liberty which Kennedy wants for Cuba is freedom for monopolies, imperialism, fascism, and colonialism, to humiliate, suffocate, or murder peoples, including the American people themselves, to whom he repeats lies until they appear to be truths. We do not want the freedom of which Kennedy speaks, and if he or his opponent Nixon attempts to impose such freedom upon us, he will learn what it means to have a people ready and willing to defend their true and only freedom.

The Havana Declaration contains a greeting to the American people and condemnation of everything Nixon, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and other imperialists represent. This Havana Declaration will be adhered to completely by an entire people ready to defend the fatherland even if the price is death.

D O M I N I C A N R E P U B L I C

LATIN AMERICAN EYES FIXED ON ELECTIONS

Ciudad Trujillo, La Voz Dominicana, in Spanish to the Dominican Republic, Oct. 18, 1960, 1100 GMT--E

(EL CARIBE editorial)

(Summary) The election campaign in the United States continues on its way. Soon it will be decided which of the two candidates, Nixon or Kennedy, will occupy the high office. All Latin America is watching the development of the presidential campaign with interest, with great hope, and with great anxiety.

Latin America hopes this election will produce a president who will take positive action on inter-American relations. For some time, grave problems, both diplomatic and economic, have resulted in a serious deterioration of inter-American solidarity. It is necessary to initiate action to revitalize the ties of friendship and neighborliness for which the American people have struggled for a hundred years; the cause of pan-Americanism must be championed.

This is the great task which faces the victor in the elections, and both candidates have recognized the problems. The United States must recover its international prestige in Latin America and inaugurate a policy which is more constructive and inspires cooperation.

In the final stage of the presidential campaign, the Democratic candidate, Kennedy, seems to be favored. The Democrats are determined to wrest power from the Republicans. Although it cannot yet be predicted who will emerge victorious, indications are that Kennedy will win. The latest public opinion polls favor Kennedy, with a 49-percent vote, over Nixon with 46, and 5 percent undecided. And Kennedy is displaying more confidence since the tide of the campaign turned his way.

For Latin America, these presidential elections hold a very special interest. There is great anxiety over the future of U.S. foreign policy following an administration which has generated so much ill feeling as has the Eisenhower administration. We do not believe that we err when we say that, in Kennedy, we see a healthy sign of a change for the better. Kennedy has shown that he is vitally interested in the welfare of Latin America and it appears that Latin America occupies a prominent place in his political plan to give preference to the problems of the people of the New World.

Kennedy has said: We need new attitudes to make the Latin American nations coparticipants in the rapid development of the Western Hemisphere. This is precisely what is needed: new attitudes, new ideas which will erase the memory of that certain stormy period of inter-American relations, and create a new climate of harmony and the true solidarity which America needs to accomplish with dignity and foresight the role which destiny has reserved for her in the future of Western civilization.

N O N C O M M U N I S T C H I N A

CHIANG REAFFIRMS STAND ON MATSU, QUEMOY

Taipei, in English to Japan and Korea, Oct. 13, 1960, 1005 GMT--W

(Summary) President Chiang Kai-shek told a visiting American correspondent recently that the Republic of China will under no circumstances give away any of the offshore islands it now holds. The President's remarks were the first official reaction from the Chinese Government to the statement made by John F. Kennedy that the offshore islands should not be included in the U.S. defense line.

Authoritative sources in Taipei, commenting on Senator Kennedy's statement, declared that Free China will fight to the death to defend

the offshore islands. Without Quemoy and Matsu, there will be no Taiwan or Pescadores, they maintain. No one in Free China wants to interfere in the domestic issues of their American ally, but Quemoy and Matsu are part of Chinese territory. It has been proved that the nation has the capabilities to defend the offshore islands, and that these islands are an integral part of the defense line of Free China.

The sources maintained that the security of Taiwan would be seriously threatened without the offshore islands. For the communists, the capture of the offshore islands is a stepping stone to the eventual assault on Taiwan itself.

These sources also warned that Senator Fulbright's observation on admitting Communist China to the United Nations borders on appeasement. His contention that the Peking regime would behave itself after being admitted to the United Nations is wishful thinking. The U.S. Government has negotiated with the Peking regime both in Geneva and in Warsaw, and the conduct of the Communist Chinese has not changed one iota. Where is the assurance that they will change their conduct after being admitted into the United Nations? The communists are not worthy of being admitted to the United Nations. Their admittance to the world body will destroy it, but will not reform the communists. The prestige of the United Nations would be hurt if the Communist Chinese shoot their way into it.

The Chinese foreign minister stated that he thought Senator Fulbright's statement reflects only his personal view and certainly does not reflect the policy of the U.S. Government.

Statement by Liu Ho-tou

Taipei, Taiwan, Home Service in Mandarin, Oct. 13, 1960, 1200 GMT--B

(Text) Taipei--Admiral Liu Ho-tou, the military spokesman of the Republic of China, on Oct. 13 said that the Republic of China will never let the communist bandits have Quemoy and Matsu. Admiral Liu Ho-tou issued a statement to UPI that China has repeatedly announced its determination to the world to safeguard Quemoy and Matsu even if it has to fight to the last man.

Foreign Ministry Statement

Taipei, Taiwan Home Service in Mandarin, Oct. 13, 1960, 1200 GMT--B

(Text) Taipei--Following the release of a statement to UPI newsmen by Admiral Liu Ho-tou, military spokesman of the Republic of China, reiterating China's determination to defend Quemoy and Matsu islands,

Shen Chien-hung, spokesman for the Foreign Ministry, has also denied that the Chinese Government has ever considered withdrawing its forces from Quemoy and Matsu islands.

Shen Chien-hung stated that such consideration is absolutely wrong. He added that many government officials have expressed deep concern over the debate on the defense of the two islands in the political circles of the United States. Many Chinese Government officials have repeatedly declared that the Chinese Government has proved on many occasions that it has sufficient power to defend the offshore islands without any help from the United States.

Yang Kuang-ta, chairman of the foreign affairs committee of the Legislative Yuan, has also expressed full support for the Chinese Government's stand on defending the offshore islands. He declared that it is his opinion that after winning the election no presidential candidate of the United States would suggest abandoning the Quemoy and Matsu islands unless the United States is preparing to withdraw from all of Asia. Yang Kuang-ta stated that a farsighted person such as Kennedy should know what damage would be done to the feelings of the people of all Asian countries if the United States, leader of the free world, suggested that one of its allied nations give up the defense of its own territory. I would like to tell my American friends, he said, that we will never withdraw from Quemoy and Matsu islands under any conditions or upon anybody's advice.

Opposition Party Position

Taipei, AFP, Radioteletype in English to Agency Offices, Oct. 14, 1960, 0915 GMT--W

(Text) Taipei, Oct. 14--The Taiwanese leaders of the opposition China Democratic Party today threw their support behind the government in defending the Nationalist Chinese position concerning Taiwan and the offshore islands. Both Li Wan-chi, publisher of the newspaper KUNG-LUN PAO, and Henry Kao, former mayor of Taipei, declared that they support the government policy of the recovery of the mainland and are opposed to the suggestion of turning Taiwan into an independent state, as voiced by U.S. Senator William Fulbright.

With publisher Lei Chen in jail, Li and Kao, who have become the top men of the new opposition party, urged the government to enforce "political reform" in order to win more friends. They conceded that prospects of the Nationalist Chinese representation in the United Nations are not bright, as indicated in the recent voting. Henry Kao, acting as spokesman for the new opposition movement, added that "only by uniting ourselves into one solid front can we save our nation from external pressure."

"The people in the United States enjoy 100 percent freedom of speech," he snapped. "Why should we get mad at Senator Fulbright's remarks?" Pointing to the fact that the Taiwanese on this island are paying 80 percent of the taxes and that their sons have been drafted into the army, the influential opposition leader asked if it was possible to keep the local people as "political underdogs" forever.

Further Liu Ho-tu Comment

Taipei, AFP, Radioteletype in English to Agency Offices, Oct. 14, 1960, 0900 GMT--W

(Excerpt) The military spokesman, Rear Admiral Liu Ho-tu, also took pains to spell out the strategic value of the tiny islands in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, for which the United States is obligated under the Sino-American mutual defense treaty. The admiral stressed that all the Nationalists want for the defense of these islands off the mainland coast is "moral and logistic support" from the United States as well as other friendly allies. "We need no American soldiers," he added. When a reporter asked him why American soldiers are not needed, the spokesman replied: "We are strong enough to hold these islands ourselves."

S O U T H V I E T N A M

CHINESE PRESS SCORES KENNEDY'S VIEWS

(Editor's Note: The following editorials are from the Chinese-language newspapers published for the large Chinese community of Saigon-Cholon. In addition to the three texts, summaries of other editorials have been excerpted from a daily press summary prepared in Saigon.)

Dispute on Offshore Islands

Cholon, YUAN TUNG JIH PAO, in Chinese, Oct. 12, 1960--S

(Editorial: "The U.S. Presidential Campaign and the Question of the Mutual Defense of Quemoy and Matsu")

(Text) With the U.S. presidential election now just four weeks away, Republican and Democratic presidential candidates Nixon and Kennedy are quickening their campaign activities in a last-minute effort to win over as many voters as possible. Only last Friday they both appeared on a nationwide television broadcast and discussed a number of major foreign policy topics in order to permit the U.S. voters to have a better understanding of their policies and thus decide which of the two will be their choice as the next president of the United States. The fact that their campaign activities are being carried out in a

fair and democratic way indicates the soundness of the U.S. democratic political system--a system of which the U.S. people can be proud. When the communists compare their controlled elections with the free and democratic elections of the United States, they should feel ashamed of themselves.

It is curious to note that in discussing the question of U.S. defense of Quemoy and Matsu, Nixon and Kennedy expressed entirely different views and completely disagreed with each other on this issue. In view of the fact that the question is closely connected with the future of Free China's counteroffensive for the recovery of the mainland, it is worthwhile for us to make a comparison of the views expressed by the two.

Let us quote what Nixon stated on the U.S. defense of Quemoy and Matsu. He said: "I think as far as Quemoy and Matsu are concerned, that the question is not these two little pieces of real estate...it is the principle involved." Now let us quote what Kennedy stated: "I do not believe that the line should be drawn at those islands, but instead at the island of Formosa. As long as they are not essential to the defense of Formosa, it has been my judgment that our line should be drawn in the sea around the island itself."

In other words, Kennedy believes that the United States should not risk the danger of world war over Quemoy and Matsu. This clearly reflects the entirely different views between Nixon and Kennedy on the question of U.S. defense of the two islands. While the former emphasizes the "principle" involved, the latter is only concerned about "realism."

According to Kennedy, the United States should draw a clear and definite line to exclude Quemoy and Matsu from the sphere of mutual defense of the island of Taiwan. Granted that the two islands are not essential to the defense of Taiwan, Kennedy, in making such a statement, has inadvertently encouraged the Chinese communists to invade and occupy the two offshore islands. This will not only greatly lower the morale of Free China, but of the free world as well.

Nixon is right when he says that the question is not that of these islands are just two pieces of real estate. What he means is that if the United States wants to give these two islands to the communists in order to avoid the risk of being dragged into a war, it is betraying a principle.

In view of the fact that these two islands are only a few miles off the coast of the Chinese mainland, it may be true that they are strategically indefensible. Though President Eisenhower has not clearly indicated whether Quemoy and Matsu are to be included within the sphere of defense of Taiwan--the U.S. President has been authorized by the Congress to make his own decision on this question--one notes

that in the past few years the Chinese communists have not dared to make a single attempt to attack these two islands, not only because of the fighting spirit of the islands' defenders, but also because they fear the U.S. Seventh Fleet might intervene. Therefore, it is a question of political rather than strategic value whether these two islands are defensible. In other words, once the United States decides to mutually defend Quemoy and Matsu, the Chinese communists will never dare to launch a move against these islands.

Kennedy has stated that it is unwise for the United States to take the chance of being dragged into a war over the two islands. We may ask: Will there be no risk for the United States in the defense of Taiwan? Kennedy should understand that the reason the Chinese communists dare not launch a military venture in the Taiwan Strait is that they fear the Nationalist army will mount a counteroffensive and the United States will retaliate. Everyone can clearly see that.

It is a sign of weakness if the United States draws a line that places Quemoy and Matsu outside the sphere of mutual defense for Taiwan. This may prompt the Chinese communists to launch a bold military move in the Taiwan Strait. Thus, in order to avoid war, the United States will instead be dragged into a major conflict which may lead to world war. It is worthwhile for the U.S. people to ponder the consequences.

Finally, it is necessary to point out that the views expressed by the U.S. presidential candidates in campaign speeches may not represent the policies they will adopt if elected. It may be that their campaign speeches are one thing and that the policies they are going to adopt, if elected, are another thing. What is important for the people and army of Free China is that in addition to fulfilling their duties and responsibilities to the country, they must make a determined effort to win the sympathy of allied countries.

Islands' Importance Stressed

Cholon, CHUNG KUO JIH PAO, in Chinese, Oct. 13, 1960--S

(Editorial: "The Question of the Defense of Quemoy and Matsu")

(Text) A few days ago, the U.S. Democratic and Republican presidential candidates, Kennedy and Nixon, held a heated debate on the question of mutual defense of Taiwan's two offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. The views expressed by the two were entirely opposite. While Nixon strongly favored the defense of these two islands, Kennedy expressed the absurd view that they should be abandoned. Since the issue is closely connected with our future, we cannot help expressing our deep dissatisfaction with Kennedy's argument, which no one can tolerate.

No one can deny that Taiwan constitutes an important fortress in the free world's defense against communism in this part of the world and that Quemoy and Matsu are two important fences for safeguarding the security of Taiwan. If the free world regards the strategic value of Taiwan highly and if it strongly believes in the defense of this island, it should pay equal attention to Quemoy and Matsu. To abandon these two offshore islands and defend only Taiwan means to tear down the fences of the home island, which will make it vulnerable to attack from the enemy; it is just like opening the door of a house to invite thieves in. No one can be so stupid. Moreover, we must not ignore the fact that, in addition to their military importance, these two offshore islands also have political and economic value. Let us explain in the following to illustrate this point:

Militarily, Quemoy and Matsu are merely a few miles off the coast of mainland China. Though it is not absolutely necessary for the Nationalist army to use the islands as steppingstones for a counteroffensive against the mainland, they are nevertheless indispensable vanguard posts.

These two islands can serve as ideal supply stations when the Nationalists carry the war to the mainland. Because of their inestimable strategic value, Quemoy and Matsu have become a thorn for the Chinese communist bigwigs who must concentrate hundreds of thousands of troops along the coast to meet the eventuality of a surprise attack from the islands' defenders.

The fact that the Chinese Communists have been forced to deploy a great deal of manpower and resources and have spent a considerable amount in military expenditures for the defense of this line indicates that they regard these two islands as a serious obstacle to carrying out their expansionist policy in Southeast Asia. As long as Quemoy and Matsu are defended by Nationalist forces, the Chinese communists will not be able to sleep in peace.

Thanks to the fighting spirit of the offshore islands' heroic defenders, the Chinese communists have been compelled to "lie low" and to slow down their policy of aggression. Without Quemoy and Matsu in Nationalist hands, the communists would have invaded Taiwan long ago and even countries in Southeast Asia. These are undeniable facts which must be recognized by all.

The fact that President Eisenhower has never issued a statement clarifying the U.S. position on the defense of these two islands proves that he is an extremely clever statesman. This has made the Chinese communists hesitate to launch a military venture. Without saying yes or no to the question, Eisenhower has succeeded in frightening the communists into postponing their plans to attack Quemoy and Matsu. We cannot but admire his clever diplomacy.

Now Kennedy wants to make his absurd view known to the communists. Instead of keeping his mouth shut, he cried out loudly that the United States should draw a definite line to exclude Quemoy and Matsu from the sphere of U.S. defense of Taiwan. He even pointed out that in order to avoid being dragged into a war, the United States should not defend these two islands which, he says, are not only not essential to the defense of Taiwan, but also strategically indefensible. How could Kennedy be so stupid?

Despite heavy shelling--more than one and one-half million rounds of artillery fire in the past 10 years--the two islands remain unshaken, a fact which has greatly increased the confidence of our 600 million compatriots on the mainland in Free China's determination to recover the country. It also reflects the firm will and capability of Nationalist forces and indicates the weakness of communist military strength.

All this has not only greatly bolstered the morale of the people in Taiwan and abroad, but has also sparked and intensified the people's anticommunist resistance movements on the mainland. Because of the successive military victories by the heroic defenders of Quemoy and Matsu, the Chinese communists have failed to suppress the people's increased revolts throughout the mainland.

If Quemoy and Matsu were lost to the communists, not only the desire for freedom of 600 million Chinese of mainland China would be hopeless, but the freedom of people in all Asia as well as in the world would be affected. Therefore, how can we regard the two islands as merely two little pieces of real estate?

Economically, these two islands constitute a serious obstacle to the communist military and economic supply lines by sea. Because of Nationalist China's blockade, the Chinese communists have been depending solely on land transportation of merchandise and materials from North China to Southeast China. The military supplies for their naval bases and airbases on Hainan Island and their military bases in Haiphong, North Vietnam, must pass through Hankow and Canton and other inconvenient areas before reaching their destination. If the offshore islands were lost, the communists could use the sea route from the port of Dairen directly to the port of Yulin, and USSR military transport could take the route from Port Arthur directly to Hainan and Haiphong. In this way, not only could the Chinese communists save time and money, but they could also impose a direct threat on the security of Southeast Asia countries.

Thus, no one can doubt the political, military, and economic importance of Quemoy and Matsu. It is unthinkable that Kennedy, as a presidential candidate of the leading free world country, could regard such an important strategic point between the two blocs as merely two little

pieces of real estate. He even consulted a map to say that these two islands, which are only five or six miles off the mainland coast, are strategically indefensible. He judged that a line should be drawn in the sea to leave the offshore islands 150 miles from Taiwan. For those who have a sense of military knowledge, such a judgment is indeed unthinkable and indicates a total lack of common sense.

The utter absurdity of his judgment makes people doubt that he once served in the navy. Let us point out a simple military question to illustrate the point: In wartime it is necessary for a combat unit setting up a camp in a certain area to send a few scouts some hundred yards away from the camp to look out for possible movement or attack from the enemy. Those who have received elementary military training can understand this. Now we may ask: Why should Taiwan, as a base for Free China's future counteroffensive for the recovery of the mainland and as a most important fortress for the free world's anticommunist lineup, pull its troops back from these two islands, two impenetrable outposts, to defend only the island itself?

We may again ask: Will Kennedy accept Khrushchev's demand to withdraw more than 200 U.S. overseas bases and defend only the Atlantic? With the exception of a few lunatics, no American would agree to this. Kennedy should understand that in the eyes of the Chinese, these two islands are much more important than the 200 U.S. overseas bases. We can only take for granted that either Kennedy has gone crazy or he made the statement without thinking.

Nixon was right when he said he hoped that Kennedy would change his mind if he should be elected. He advanced the most clear-sighted view that "if we abandon Quemoy and Matsu, we start a chain reaction because the communists are not only after these two islands." No wonder Nixon accused Kennedy of "woolly thinking."

Kennedy Defeat Predicted

QUEMOY, MATSU MAY SPELL KENNEDY DEFEAT

Cholon, AH CHAU JIH PAO, in Chinese, Oct. 18, 1960--3

(Editorial: "Nixon Steady, Kennedy Reckless")

(Excerpts) With the election drawing closer, the U.S. Republican and Democratic presidential candidates are now engaged in an unprecedented seesaw battle in a final effort to win as many votes as possible. Reactions to the two candidates' speeches from various circles indicate that both have had their favorable and unfavorable moments. Thus, it is extremely difficult to say which of the two is definitely enjoying a favorable position which may assure his future victory.

Both Nixon and Kennedy are clever enough to make the most of foreign policy topics in order to impress the U.S. people. Besides making personal tours throughout the country to expound their respective views on world issues, they have also appeared many times on television discussing and advancing their arguments on major international topics.

What Nixon and Kennedy have said on foreign affairs indicates that the former has expressed a comparatively steady and conservative view, while the latter expresses a volatile and more or less reckless view. The key to their victory will depend on whether the U.S. people prefer Nixon's steadiness or Kennedy's volatility.

We once pointed out that Nixon is more experienced than Kennedy because of his eight-year role as vice president. However, we must not ignore Kennedy's good relations with the people. The fact that neither Nixon nor Kennedy has the magnetic appeal and high prestige of Eisenhower or Roosevelt, both of whom scored landslide victories over the opponents, indicates that their views on foreign policy constitute a decisive factor in the election. But Nixon is definitely enjoying the advantage over Kennedy on one point: He has the whole-hearted support of President Eisenhower.

In the eyes of the U.S. people, Eisenhower is not only a war hero, but also a kindly old man who has devoted his whole life to the cause of peace and freedom. They feel so close to him that they consider his every gesture and action a correct pattern for them to follow. He is the only person capable of influencing and winning the full support for the Vice President. Eisenhower has contributed greatly to increasing Nixon's prestige and bolstering his position, a boost which Kennedy does not enjoy.

Furthermore, Kennedy has made a reckless and wrong move on the question of U.S. defense in the Far East. While strongly favoring the defense of Berlin in order that it will become a protective wall for assuring peace in Europe, he proposes the abandonment of Quemoy and Matsu in order that the United States will avoid being dragged into a war. Now let us coolly ponder Kennedy's two entirely different views: Is there a difference between Europe's Berlin and Asia's Quemoy and Matsu? Since he is determined to safeguard peace in Europe, why is he not determined to safeguard the same peace in Asia? As a future leader of the free world, how can Kennedy entertain such a biased view? Will such a view be supported by the U.S. people?

Moreover, Kennedy today proposes the abandonment of Quemoy and Matsu in order that the United States will not be dragged into a war. Who can tell but that tomorrow he will call for the abandonment of Hong Kong, and the day after tomorrow favor the removal of allied troops from Berlin in order to insure that his country will not be dragged into war with the Chinese and Soviet communists?

His view regarding Quemoy and Matsu may spell his defeat in the coming U.S. presidential election. The reason is simple: The U.S. people always regard foreign policy as more important than domestic issues. As long as the U.S. people believe that U.S. defense in the Far East should remain unchanged, Kennedy will certainly be defeated in the election.

Other Papers' Views

CHUNG KUO JIH PAO on Oct. 17 attacked Senator Kennedy's "absurd and cowardly view," comparing him to Neville Chamberlain, "whose appeasement of Hitler at the expense of Czechoslovakia only led to World War II." The defense of the islands is solely the affair of the Republic of China, the paper concluded, and the United States has absolutely no right to force Taipei to give them up to the communists. MAY JIH LUAN ZAN accused the Senator of making the islands' defense the main topic in his campaign as a device to win votes at Nationalist China's expense. The paper concluded: "If these two islands are abandoned, all talk about safeguarding U.S. security and the free world's freedom will be nothing but a hollow shell. Let us tell Kennedy that no matter what the U.S. decision on Quemoy and Matsu may be, Nationalist China will never abandon the offshore islands." SUN WUN JIH PAO welcomed Chiang Kai-shek's reply to "Kennedy's shortsighted view" and praised Vice President Nixon's position--"that any appeasement of Communist China will only lead to war"--as correct and clear-sighted. The paper added: "Unless Kennedy abandons his absurd view and stops flirting with the Chinese communists, he will be the target of the criticism of freedom-loving people throughout the world."

On Oct. 18 SHIN YUEH JIH PAO asserted that "we must stand our ground firmly and determine to defend these islands; we must not be influenced by the views of others into changing our position." SHIN SHUN JIH PAO accused Senator Kennedy of "obviously trying to please the communists at the expense of Nationalist China."

On Oct. 19 CHUNG KUO JIH PAO hailed Chiang Kai-shek's statement that Quemoy and Matsu would be defended to the last man; the paper termed the statement a "firm rebuke to Kennedy's absurd view" that the islands should be abandoned. The newspaper's editorial concluded: "If your neighbor asks you to give up part of your garden, or your house, or even your wife, would you accept? Any normal person would give him a piece of his mind. Since no one likes having his character maligned, how can we endure having our national character insulted?" We wonder how Kennedy, as a presidential candidate of the world's leading nation, could express such an insane view." MAY JIH LUAN ZAN culminated a sharp attack on Senator Fulbright's advocacy of a United Nations seat for Communist China in these words: "Fulbright

must have seen Khrushchev's hooligan behavior at the U.N. session. The United Nations has had enough problems dealing with the Soviet Union alone; with the participation of Communist China the world peace organization would be reduced to utter confusion."

A U S T R A L I A

LITTLE DIFFERENCE IN POSITIONS SEEN

Melbourne, Australian Overseas Service in English, Oct. 18, 1960,
0850 GMT--W

(Summary) The campaign for the election of the president of the United States, which is gaining increasing world attention, is probably the most important election in the whole democratic world, although our press can find little difference in the foreign policies of the two candidates.

The Melbourne AGE says: "Federal politicians in Australia are always able to tell the voters where they stand on pressing international issues. They can do so with the comfortable knowledge that neither Washington nor Moscow is deeply interested in their policies. American voters will go to the polls to elect a representative whose presence at future world conferences may determine the history of the next four years in the diplomatic conflict between the great power blocs. Foreign affairs have been well aired in prelection debates, but we may agree with Khrushchev, for once at least, in saying that the decision is one for the American people, as they are preparing to do business with the candidate they choose, whichever he may be. Although both are making the most of their party disagreements, this is all part of the ritual of the presidential election. To the outside world there does not seem to be very much difference if the Republicans retain control of the White House or the Democrats return to power," concludes the Melbourne AGE.